



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

OCTOBER MEETING, 1898.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 13th instant, at three o'clock, P. M., in the Library of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Beacon Street, the President, CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL.D., in the chair.

The record of the June meeting was read and approved; and the Librarian read the list of donors to the Library during the summer vacation.

The Corresponding Secretary said that he had received letters of acceptance from Rev. James DeNormandie, D.D., elected a Resident Member, and from John F. Jameson, Ph.D., elected a Corresponding Member at the June meeting.

The President reported from the Council the following vote, which was unanimously adopted:—

Voted: That, in arranging the furniture and decoration of the Ellis Hall in the Society's new building, the Council be directed to make special provision for the separate deposit and preservation of the papers of President Thomas Jefferson, given to the Society at its June meeting by its associate member and Vice-President, the Honorable Thomas Jefferson Coolidge; and further that, in special recognition of the value of this gift, and the gratitude of the Society therefor, a suitable record be prepared, and at the proper time inscribed on the place of deposit, indicating the character of the collection, the date of its gift, and the source whence it came.

The report on the publication of memorial editions of Bradford's History of Plymouth and Winthrop's History of New England, which had been assigned for consideration at this meeting, was then taken up; and Mr. ROBERT C. WINTHROP, Jr., said:—

When this subject last came up I was taken by surprise, and having subsequently found that part of what I said on the spur

of the moment was not fully understood, I have thought it prudent to put in writing what I now wish to say.

Those who were present at the June meeting may remember the earnestness with which I deprecated immediate action. I had been under the impression that an agreement existed by which the recommendations of the Committee were to be printed for subsequent consideration, and, moreover, so far as I could gather, there had been no actual meeting of the Committee, the report read by the Chair having been submitted to the Council less than an hour before. To adopt it under such circumstances seemed to me too summary a proceeding; nor was protracted discussion desirable in courtesy to Vice-President Coolidge, who was known to have come prepared with an important communication, the length of which could not be foreseen.

A postponement was therefore granted, and, being now in position to state my views more fully, I will mention by way of preface that, having been well acquainted with every President we have had since 1835, five in all, and intimate with several of them, I have formed the deliberate opinion that not one of his four immediate predecessors has surpassed the present incumbent in zeal for the welfare of the Society. I say this, because it may have seemed to members who attend meetings irregularly and are more or less unfamiliar with the ins and outs of this body, that I sometimes exhibit a sort of antagonism to the Chair, whereas, in point of fact, our differences are rare, and only those liable to occur between old friends interested in the same subject but looking at it from opposite points of view. In short, to make use of an expression not long ago uttered by our associate Hoar with reference to our associate Lodge, "the personal relations existing between us are of the most cordial and delightful character."

The plan under consideration was first suggested at the April meeting, and the ability with which the President has developed it cannot fail to have impressed all who then listened to him or who have since read his remarks in print,—an impression which will be deepened, I doubt not, by the more elaborate argument anticipated from him to-day. For aught I know, I was at the outset—and perhaps still am—the only member who has felt serious misgivings. Having had a good deal to do with the Society's publications for

twenty years back, and being familiar with most of its earlier ones, I have become attached — unduly attached, it may be — to the simple, time-honored, deliberate fashion in which, for considerably more than a century, we have issued historical material without flourish and without advertisement, — enabling the public to buy if it saw fit, but placing no reliance upon large returns from sales, — aiming rather at the appreciation of the student than the interest of the general reader. I shrink, I confess, from placing ourselves to a greater or less degree in the hands of publishers or booksellers, and from exchanging our sparingly illustrated volumes for what our late associate Parkman used to style “historical picture-books.”

So far from my enthusiasm having been aroused by a prospect of “monumental memorial editions, enriched by charts, maps, and fac-similes done in the highest style of art, with portraits and other pictorial matter illustrative of the text, on a scale regardless of expense within every reasonable limit,” there has somehow or other rung in my ears the recollection of very similar phrases employed from time to time by a less distinguished but equally energetic graduate of Harvard, — Mr. Moses King, — whose alluring circulars I remember to my cost. I doubt whether this is quite the sort of thing contemplated by Charles Deane; and in considering the possibility of obtaining increased circulation by new methods, I am reminded of a discussion I once had with a friend concerning what he called “the great improvement in the ‘North American Review’ effected by Thorndike Rice”, and when I contended that notoriety is no criterion of excellence, and that this periodical, as successively edited in the past by so many of our associates, afforded a more dignified and scholarly intellectual *pabulum* than the *olla podrida* which succeeded it.

Another consideration that weighs with me is the expense. The highest style of art is costly. In a conversation I had with the President early in May, he told me he had in view an outlay of fully \$10,000, but that he hoped to get most of it back; and in the report made in June he goes farther, stating that “while there should be no danger of any considerable loss, the sales might result in a favorable balance.” It is within my knowledge that persons of a good deal of experience in such matters consider this a very sanguine estimate. The price of an ordinary volume of the Society’s publications is,

to the average purchaser, \$3; but it is obvious that these exceptional volumes will have to be put at \$5, and as the report states there will probably be five, this would make the price \$25 the set. Now, we are bound in common decency, as it seems to me, to adhere to our uniform practice of distributing *gratis* among members and among a number of institutions, which distribution, together with press-copies required by publishers, would dispose of an edition of not less than 200 sets without any pecuniary return whatever.

Sales would then begin, but after the first go-off be gradual, as all our sales have been, — not one of our volumes, not even Sewall's Diary, having yet paid its expenses, — and I venture to make what may appear to some of you an extravagant, and what is undoubtedly a rather lugubrious prediction, that before we have got rid of enough of these \$25 sets to reimburse us, all present at this meeting will be in their graves. This, however, would matter little if our income were larger, but while, by the generosity of successive benefactors, and under the skilful management of the present Treasurer, our publishing-funds now much exceed, I am told, those of any learned society in this country, yet they are by no means inexhaustible, and careful discrimination has to be exercised in the selection of material. I was a good deal struck by the force of a remark made some little time ago by one of the youngest and ablest of our number, — Mr. Lawrence Lowell, — with whom Professor Hart and others are understood to be in accord, that the time has come for devoting less space to publications of the Colonial and Revolutionary periods, and for beginning to print selections from manuscripts of the close of the last and early part of the present centuries, — such, for instance, as the greater portion of the Jefferson Papers recently received, — and I, for one, should feel very uncomfortable if by any loss resulting from the proposed undertaking, the tilling of this later field should be retarded.

In conversation with several members of the Committee, I therefore suggested a compromise by which we should separate the contemplated reprints, begin with one, and see what the result would be. In such case we should obviously give precedence to Bradford, not merely because he came over earlier and his history is the shorter of the two, but also because the Society happens to be favorably constituted for edit-

ing it, embracing as it does Mr. Lord, who is understood to be engaged on a Life of Bradford, with such essentially suitable Plymouth men as Mr. Winslow Warren and Mr. Morton Dexter, to say nothing of the valuable aid which may reasonably be expected from the President. I am accordingly about to move that the publication of a new edition of Winthrop's New England be for the present postponed. Should this motion pass, the Society will be free to proceed with Bradford and take up Winthrop hereafter, if it sees fit. Should this motion not pass, the report is likely to be adopted, and I am thus constrained to call attention to the personal character of my objections.

The three manuscript parts of Winthrop's New England (one of which was unhappily destroyed by fire, though not until Mr. Savage had copied it) were originally included in the collection conventionally known as the Winthrop Papers, — a collection controlled for the last fifteen years by me, and previously by my father and others of my family. At the solicitation of my grandfather, the three manuscripts in question were, in 1803, given absolutely to the Society by his elder brother, Francis B. Winthrop of New York, who had removed thither the collection aforesaid. Strictly speaking, my great-uncle actually delivered but two of the parts, the third having been loaned prior to the Revolution and then lost sight of, but it turned up early in 1816. Its recovery stimulated a wish to see the whole in print, — the incomplete edition of 1790 containing numerous errors, — and it was first intended that the new publication should form part of the Society's Collections, a committee being appointed for this purpose in October, 1816. After protracted consultation, however, the plan was changed, Mr. Savage was made sole editor with authority to take out a private copyright, but, at his desire, there was informally associated with him an elder brother of my father's, the late James Bowdoin, who was becoming prominent in antiquarian pursuits.¹ The first volume of their joint labors appeared in

¹ The account of all this in our published Proceedings is meagre, but additional particulars are supplied by existing correspondence. The brothers F. B. and T. L. Winthrop consented at the outset to assume a pecuniary responsibility in case of loss, but they were unwilling to bind their heirs, and the death of the first-named put an end to the agreement. Later, a Committee of the Society, of which T. L. Winthrop was Chairman, applied to the Legislature to help along the work, and the State agreed to take three hundred and fifty copies.

1825, the second in 1826, and they were already looking forward to a revised edition when, in 1833, my uncle died, and Mr. Savage wrote:—

“I am too far advanced in life to anticipate the opportunity of ever forming so close an intimacy with any other man, in view of our constant daily intercourse for so many years, and the congeniality of our studies and pursuits, some of which may now have to be abandoned.”

When he penned these lines Savage was not quite forty-nine years old, but his anticipations were realized and he produced the edition of 1853 without assistance.¹ The Winthrop Papers had then long been divided, much the largest slice having been inherited by a kinsman of mine, whose horror of autograph-fiends was such that for nearly forty years he refused access to them even to near relatives. At the close of 1860, however, they came into my father's possession, and when selections from them began to be printed in the *Life of John Winthrop* and in volumes of our *Collections*, Mr. Savage perceived that the new material in course of accumulation would ultimately necessitate very considerable changes both in his annotation and appendix. Towards the close of his life, but before that failure of memory which began to manifest itself in his last years, he had repeated conferences with my father on this subject. The conclusion they reached was that Winthrop's *New England* in its entirety was essentially a work for historical students,—that the edition of 1853, supplemented by the later publications to which I have just referred, would answer the needs of students for a long time to come,—that it was undesirable to undertake a revised edition until all sources of information should be exhausted, and that the work should eventually be intrusted to some exceptionally competent and careful man, who would do it leisurely and thoroughly, making it, as Mr. Savage had done, a labor of love. They were full in the faith that additional letters, bearing directly upon the subject, would come to light in unexpected quarters, more particularly some of those which Governor Winthrop is known to have written to influential persons in England de-

¹ It is noticeable that nine years intervened between his appointment to a Committee on Winthrop's *New England* in 1816 and his publication of the first volume of that work in 1825. While it is not to be inferred that he was unremittingly engaged upon it during this long period, yet it undoubtedly constituted his chief occupation, except during his absence in Europe.

scribing the condition and needs of the Colony, and although these expectations have as yet been only partially realized, there is good reason not to despair of further acquisitions.¹

I would not, however, be understood as contending that we should wait indefinitely for further material for a revised appendix, but what I do contend is that it is a mistake to push this reprint at present, when, taking into careful consideration *age, health, and other occupations*, there is, in my judgment, no one in the Society who is pre-eminently fitted to be the Savage of a third edition, though I am confident that sooner or later the right man will turn up. The President honestly believes that I unnecessarily exaggerate the difficulties of the undertaking and the length of time required to bring it to a successful issue. This is, of course, a matter of opinion; and it would serve no useful purpose if I devoted more of a short October afternoon to an endeavor to explain how I think the book ought or ought not to be edited, and precisely what sort of person ought to be intrusted with it. This last is a delicate subject, and however guardedly one may word reservations, there is always a danger of their being misconstrued. It would not be fair to represent the view I take as involving a particle of disparagement. No one has a fuller and heartier appreciation than I of the value of the editorial work in connection with early New England history which has been done by the President of this Society and by a number of its members. No one is more sensible than I that others of our associates might, could they spare time enough, equally distinguish themselves in the same line. When I was asked at the outset whether I would be one of the proposed Committee, I thought the matter over and decided that, in view of my very uncertain health in my old age, and in view of occupations which have a prior claim upon me, I could not render in such a capacity what would be—to myself, at least—a satisfying service. I felt more or less similarly about others. I thought, and still think,

¹ In this connection it is worth mentioning that when our late associate James Russell Lowell was last abroad, he was shown a long letter from Governor Winthrop just discovered in a country-house in the west of England. The difficulty of the handwriting prevented Mr. Lowell from taking a copy, but he read enough to perceive its importance, and was promised a photograph of it. By a most unlucky chance, the owner of the manuscript and his only son both died soon after, and in the confusion which resulted the letter was mislaid, and, in spite of repeated searches, has not yet reappeared.

that we need for this purpose not merely a man of physical and intellectual vigor, of thorough acquaintance with the subject, but also of considerable leisure, whose attention would not be liable to be distracted by objects and interests of a different nature.

In conclusion, as action was postponed last June upon my motion, and as, owing to the summer vacation, three months have now intervened, I should be sorry to be suspected of having button-holed members in the dog-days in order to expound my side of this controversy. So far from it, with the exception of correcting in the mind of Mr. Lothrop a misapprehension with regard to a matter of fact, I have given the subject a wide berth, and am, so far as I know, fighting the battle this afternoon single-handed, having against me not only the deservedly great authority of the President, but, ostensibly, the entire Council. I say ostensibly, because I entertain a hope that some of them may not have closely examined the scheme, and that others may not be wholly eager for it. Be this as it may, my own position lies in a nutshell. In view of the facts I have outlined, — to say nothing of others upon which I might have enlarged, had I seen fit, — I consider that, as the representative of the donor and of those immediately concerned in earlier editions, I am fairly entitled to protest against a new edition being undertaken without my assent, which assent I am as yet unwilling to give. On the other hand, I do not ask for postponement as a matter of favor. If it shall seem to a majority of members present that my claim is untenable and even presumptuous, they are welcome to override me, in which case, while I shall undoubtedly feel somewhat aggrieved, I have not the smallest intention of ventilating such a grievance in an unbecoming manner.

I move, Sir, that the publication of a new edition of Winthrop's New England be for the present postponed.

At the request of the President, the senior Vice-President, Dr. Samuel A. Green, took the chair. Mr. ADAMS then said : —

I have not come here prepared to make any argument in support of the proposition submitted by the Council. It has been fully, and in my judgment sufficiently, explained in the report printed in full in the Society's Proceedings, a copy

of which has been sent to, and, presumably, read by every member present. I shall not, therefore, now reiterate what has there been said. Massachusetts, and Massachusetts alone among political communities, so far as I know, has two extraordinary contemporaneous records, — her *Genesis* and her *Exodus*, — written down almost day by day as she first went out, by the two men who largely guided that going out. Ours is the Massachusetts Historical Society; and upon our Society the mere existence of those records, in my judgment, imposes an obligation, — an obligation emphasized by the custody of one of them. The only question, as I see it, is whether we will recognize and fulfil that obligation.

Take the case of Winthrop's history, to which our friend has more particularly referred, and upon which he makes such a special point. The Winthrop is our property, — the manuscript of it, or so much of that manuscript as is left, is our most precious possession. How it came to be so Mr. Winthrop has just explained. There have been three editions of the Winthrop published, — the Hartford edition of 1790; then, thirty-five years later, in 1825, Mr. Savage's first annotated edition; and, finally, in 1853, his more fully annotated second edition. In preparing these editions, Mr. Savage really represented our Society; his work was its work. In all but the name, he was its committee. On this point the record is clear; for the Society will remember that the last portion of Winthrop's manuscript was found, in 1816, "buried beneath a mass of pamphlets and papers" of the Prince collection, in the belfry of the Old South meeting-house; the first two parts, given to this Society in 1803, and previously loaned to both Governor Trumbull and Dr. Belknap, had long been in print. The newly discovered portion was likewise deposited with us, and it was at once proposed to publish the whole as part of our "Collections," just as Hubbard's *History* was published at about that same time. The matter was, in fact, actually referred to the Publishing Committee of that year. But Mr. Savage then, with characteristic zeal, took the work in hand, and, at the August meeting of 1816, reported the progress he had already made, receiving the formal thanks of the Society for "this great and valuable service." He with two others, Judge John Davis and Dr. Abiel Holmes, were then appointed as a special committee "to consider and report on the printing

of an entire edition of Winthrop's Journal." This was more than fourscore years ago; and the Society as then constituted thus recognized its obligation. At the next meeting Dr. Holmes reported in part from this Committee, recommending "the issuing of proposals for an edition" of the Journal as a whole. Nothing further then came of the matter, for the undertaking seems to have been thought — probably was — beyond the very limited resources of the Society; but in 1824 another Committee was appointed "to apply to the Legislature for assistance" in the proposed publication. Mr. Savage was a member of this Committee, and the first volume of the earlier of the two editions annotated by him was published only a year later, in 1825, and the second volume in 1826. His next, and last, edition was published in 1853, he then being President of our Society.

Thus thirty-five years elapsed between the first and second editions of Winthrop; and twenty-eight between the second edition and the third. Since the third was published, forty-five years, almost half a century, have already passed. For more than twenty of these forty-five years, the book — the first classic of Massachusetts — has been out of print. To-day, as for years past, if any collector, any scholar, — yes! any public library even, wishes to obtain a copy of Winthrop's history, the book of the Massachusetts Exodus, — and what public library, at least, should be without it! — he must go to a dealer and wait patiently until a second-hand copy turns up. For years a score, the publishers have not had a copy on their shelves. I hold that this is not creditable, — that, on the contrary, it is altogether discreditable; and that in this respect we, both as the Massachusetts Historical Society and the custodians of Winthrop's manuscript, are not showing a proper sense of our obligations. In my estimation, it is, so far as we are concerned, a case of flagrant delinquency.

So, also, of the Bradford. That we published as a volume of our Collections. This was more than forty years ago, and in so doing we then did show a prompt and proper sense of our obligations, — that, and nothing more. As soon as the lost manuscript was surely located in the Fulham library, we caused it to be copied, as we ought to have done, and of it we at once published an annotated edition, as, in view of our name, it was, I consider, our bounden duty to do.

In the light of this record, the present proposition explains itself. It is simply that we again proceed, as was recommended by the Committee of 1816, to issue "proposals for an edition," and—as a Society—forthwith to bring out in uniform shape these two great historical works; an edition, as set forth in the report of the Council, at once memorial and monumental.

Mr. Winthrop, quoting the late Francis Parkman in that connection, refers to the project as another undertaking in the line of what he terms "pictorial" history, or "historical picture-books," as I think he somewhat contemptuously described them, and, as such, unworthy of this Society. I shall not waste time over that suggestion. There are picture-books and picture-books, as there are histories and histories. While a poor or sensational picture-book, like a certain description of history, is an unworthy and discreditable thing, I cannot think that finely executed portraits of the characters mentioned, reproductions of contemporaneous maps and charts, and well executed facsimiles of important documents, in any way detract from the value of historical publications, or are derogatory to editors, whether individuals or societies. When his widow, thoughtfully devising some lasting memorial to her dead husband, published the superb illustrated edition of the late J. R. Green's "Short History of the English People," it never occurred to me, as I admiringly turned over its pathetic pages, that her so doing was in any way open to derisive criticism. I then thought—I still think—that, in thus also making it memorial, she added greatly to the value as well as the interest of a monumental historical work. I would do the same now, as the report before you recommends, by Bradford and Winthrop, in connection with James Savage and Charles Deane.

But Mr. Winthrop also urges the difficulty of the undertaking,—that we have no one competent to do the work of editing. I differ from him entirely, and in both respects. In the first place I hold that the work of editing Bradford and Winthrop is not difficult,—not nearly so difficult, for instance, as that of editing works of a similar character relating to subsequent and less studied periods. And in this matter I claim to speak with a degree of authority, as having myself, for the Prince Society, edited the "New English Canaan" and Welde's "Short Story." Those pub-

lications related to two of the most difficult and obscure incidents in the settlement of Massachusetts, — the prehistoric colonization promoted by Sir Ferdinand Gorges, and the subsequent Antinomian controversy. I well remember that my predecessor, as President of our Society, alluded to my edition of the "New Canaan" as the exhumation of a long-buried and wholly forgotten historical deposit. That work I found, as at the time I stated, most fascinating; and it was most fascinating largely because the period to which it related had been subjected by others — generally specialists or local authorities — to such microscopic investigation. Everything, somewhere and by somebody, had been laid bare. And this can be said of no other period of our history. This microscopic investigation has also been almost wholly the work of the last fifty years, — the years that have elapsed since Savage edited Winthrop, and Bradford was discovered. Since then works of all the contemporaneous writers have been edited by men making a special study of each; and every one of the original towns and early churches of Massachusetts has had its quarter-millennial celebration and its local historian. Even so long ago as when Palfrey wrote, he had before him Savage's last edition of Winthrop and Deane's Bradford. What I, therefore, want the Society to do is to collect these scattered rays of slowly accumulated historical light, and concentrate them in one broad stream on the pages of the two original authorities. Every one who has of late years had occasion to consult those authorities, knows that the notes of Savage need practically to be recast and rewritten; those of Deane need to be revised and enlarged. And let me again, in this connection, refer to my own investigations for purposes of illustration. Some here perhaps remember a paper I years ago read to the Society relating to Sir Christopher Gardiner, — a forgotten, almost unnoticed character, who appears mysteriously in the records of both Winthrop and Bradford. Those who do recall that paper will also remember the strange piece of work made by both Savage and Palfrey in relation to Gardiner, and the blunders into which they both fell in what they said of him. In almost no respect were they correct in their statements. This is only one example among many. These mistakes, whether of omission or commission, need now to be set right; but the new lights are scattered

everywhere, and almost inaccessible, — in well-nigh innumerable town records, in monographs, in municipal histories, in funeral and occasional discourses, in biographies, and in the proceedings of local historical societies. The general reader or historical investigator who now consults Winthrop or Bradford cannot possibly stop to look these things up; and without reference to them the annals are only partially intelligible. I submit, then, that, in the first place, it is our special function to concentrate this light; and, in the second place, that so doing is not difficult. There are, I believe, twenty men in Massachusetts, and at least a dozen in this Society, in every way qualified for the task. It only remains for us to set them to work upon it.

But it is again argued that the date suggested for publication is too near, — that it would involve hasty work, and that hasty work is bad and inaccurate work. But what is that work? I want to emphasize the fact that here we are not opening a path, — this now proposed is not pioneering. Quite the reverse. We only propose to follow in the well-worn steps of two such skilled and thorough investigators as Savage and Deane. They were pioneers; they did break out a path. And how long did they take in doing it? — Resuming his editorial work on his return from a visit to Europe in 1823, Savage published the first volume of his edition of Winthrop in 1825, and the second in 1826. Charles Deane did even better than that, — perhaps I might say more hasty work than that. He has left on record the fact that the manuscript copy of Bradford came into his hands on the 3d of August, 1855, and the preface to his annotated edition bore date April 16, 1856. Eight months and twelve days sufficed then to do that work for the mere revision of which four times the space is now pronounced dangerously short. Have we indeed so far degenerated!

It is next urged that we should, adhering to our custom, print for ourselves, avoiding, as undignified, as in some way compromising, all dealings with publishers and book agents. I confess I wholly fail to see anything compromising or undignified, whether for a society or an individual editor, in leaving the work of publishing to a professional publisher. In the case proposed we are neither printing the dry, raw material of history, nor are we venturing on an untried ex-

periment. We are printing and reprinting our own material, — doing it for the general use of readers, scholars, and investigators, and doing it, as we did it before, through a publisher. For it was through a publisher that Mr. Savage in 1825, and again in 1853, brought out his editions of Winthrop; and turning to the titlepage of Deane's Bradford, I find the following imprimatur, "Boston: Published for the Society, by Little, Brown & Co." That was two-and-forty years ago. What else, I ask, is proposed now?

Mr. Winthrop has then alluded to the well-known obligations the Society is under to the family he now represents for the gift of manuscripts, and suggests that, at least as respects a new edition of Winthrop at this time, his wishes should be respected. No one is less disposed than I to make light of the value of the Winthrops, either to New England or to the Massachusetts Historical Society. I well remember, though I cannot say I went altogether with him, once hearing the late Dr. Ellis suggest that our Society might even appropriately have been designated "The Winthrop Historical Society of Massachusetts," instead of by the name we bear. Nevertheless, in this matter it seems to me our associate carries the principle of family proprietorship to its extreme limit. There must somewhere be an historical statute of limitations applicable even to descendants; and to John Winthrop — dying two centuries and a half ago — I submit this statute applies, however liberal its term may be. Even, also, admitting that the manuscript of John Winthrop's history came to us through the family of his representative descendant here, that manuscript was in print more than thirty years before we first published it, and the copyright of the notes even of the last of our editions expired nearly a generation ago. It is public property. Any book-seller is, therefore, now free to bring out a new edition of Winthrop, with any kind of notes by any sort of an editor, as a mere business venture; and, if we persist in ignoring our obligations, I am obliged to say I think that some publisher will be justified in doing it. If, as I believe, a public demand exists, it will not much longer remain unsatisfied, whether we satisfy it, or leave the work of satisfying it to others.

Into the financial details of the proposed undertaking I do not propose to enter. It would be tedious so to do. They

were carefully gone into with experienced publishers by the Committee of the Society having that aspect of the matter in charge, and their conclusions are set forth in the report now under consideration. Of course, it goes without saying that everything of the sort involves some financial risk. If we wait for a certainty in this respect, we will wait forever. I can only say, in this case, the Committee felt satisfied that, in the sense of obligation met, and in the result of prestige to be secured, it would be advisable for our Society to go forward in the project, even at the total loss of all the money the proposed editions were estimated to cost; while, on the other hand, there was good reason to believe that in the year 1900 collectors, students, and public libraries could be depended on to absorb an edition of Winthrop at least as quickly as they had absorbed one in 1853. They did it then; why not now? Above all, it is to be remembered that the proposed editions would, from their high standard and completeness, supersede all other and previous editions, whether private or public; for it is a fact, as well ascertained as it is noticeable, that, in rare books as well as in other things that are rare, the modern purchaser, and most of all the modern American purchaser, wants always the best. That only survives; and, regardless almost of price, is always sought for.

In closing I have only further to say that this is a matter in which, as President of the Society, and consequently to a certain extent responsible for its policy, I feel a very considerable interest. Our Society, I confess, has seemed to me of late to show a tendency towards living on its past,—a tendency unpleasantly suggestive of decadence. With societies no more than with individuals, do I believe in living on the past. The purpose—the object and the end—for which our Society was originally created has either been fulfilled or has passed away. It was designed to be a species of catch-basin of historical material,—a reservoir into which all sorts of records and memorials, otherwise likely to perish, would naturally drift, and there be preserved. How well that function has been performed our collections show. But that work is done. If to-morrow we, as an organization, ceased to exist, almost innumerable other organizations of a like nature, but younger, would perform the function we were created to perform. Provided we did not carry our collections out of existence with

us, we would hardly be missed. Societies, placed as our great good fortune and the labors of those gone before have placed us, incline always to routine and inertia. They fall insensibly into ruts, and grow to misconceive things; sometimes even wandering so far from a just appreciation of realities as to mistake dulness for sobriety, and inutility for dignity. This we have thus far in great measure escaped, thanks largely to my predecessors in office; and it would be to me a source of profound regret were I to observe, or think I observed, a tendency in that direction while, by your favor, I occupy the position I now do. But, I submit, if it would avoid this danger, our Society, no more than other societies, can afford to sit down in a spirit of self-complacent content, wrapt in the contemplation of its own dignity; nor is it enough for it to give evidence of a continued existence by periodically emitting additions to the already unduly large accumulations of what is commonly known as the raw material of history. Any society, any individual, can do that. To really justify a continued existence for a Society like ours, new fields of activity and usefulness must, I submit, ever be found,—new and higher standards of scholarship and investigation striven for. I want to see something attempted in that direction now, in logical development of what we have heretofore done. But as on this aspect of the situation I propose hereafter, and at no remote day, to express my views more fully, I will not further dilate upon it now. Suffice it to say that, so far as the Council is concerned, the scheme under consideration has been well considered; and it only remains for me to express the regret I am confident others here feel as well as I, at the line of conduct our friend Mr. Winthrop has, after full consideration I know, and for reasons which seem to him conclusive, felt it incumbent upon him to pursue. I will confess I had originally hoped he would enter with zeal into the scheme, for he is in many respects, and those the most essential, peculiarly qualified to co-operate in carrying it out. And to my mind there would have been a peculiar propriety in associating his name with that of his great ancestor in a work which, while it could hardly have failed to redound greatly to the prestige of our Society, would also have stood as a permanent historical monument, not only of the founders of Massachusetts, and of eminent workers of our number now gone, but of the Massachusetts

skill, scholarship, and thorough historical investigation of our own day and generation.

Mr. HORACE E. SCUDDER said that he regretted that the proposal to publish had taken the form recommended by the Council. For his part, he was unreservedly in favor of the reissue of both works, with suitable annotation, but he thought there was an objection to departing from the long-established form and manner of publication used by the Society. Its function as a publishing agency was clearly defined, and differentiated from that of commercial publishers. It had honorably discharged this function by the free publication of its Proceedings and the several volumes of its Collections. If it stepped aside from this policy and allied itself with any publishing-house for the purpose of appealing to the general public with a sumptuous edition of either work, it would embarrass itself. Such an experiment was a costly one, and in order to recoup itself by sales, it would be necessary to adopt the measures of a publishing-house, to adjust its own notions of form and embellishment to those of the publisher, and to accept the publisher's mode, it might be, of a personal canvass. At all events, by the publication of these histories in a "monumental" form, it was making a direct bid for popular sale, and he would remind the Society that, inasmuch as it must scrupulously publish the volumes in their entirety, it must stand the consequences of asking the public to buy what it could not properly ask the general reader to read. He hoped the Society would republish the histories and distribute them in their customary manner, and that ultimately certain portions, especially of Bradford, might become the common property of the general public through use in schools.

Professor HART spoke substantially as follows: —

Mr. President, — We have heard to-day the expression of views from several different standpoints upon this question of publication. We have listened to the divergent opinions of investigators; we have had some intimation of the standpoint of the publishers; perhaps there is room for some suggestion from the point of view of a teacher, who desires to have the greatest sources of our national history made available for the student.

The Massachusetts Historical Society and its members are not shut in to any one form of publication, and habitually make use of at least three, — the publication of texts; the publication of texts with elaborate notes; and the publication of secondary works. Is it necessary that the learning of the Society should be confined to any one of these forms? Our President has himself several times chosen to put the results of his discriminating labors into the form of systematic secondary works. It is, to be sure, not the practice of the Society itself to publish such results of study, even of its own members; but perhaps it might be worth considering whether monographs might not be also a suitable form for the activities of the Society. The second form of publication is one in which the Society has won great and deserved distinction, the issuance of authentic texts embellished and enlarged for scholarly ends. This is the form in which the previous editions of Bradford and Winthrop have been put forth by this Society, but this is a long, expensive, and difficult process which involves the labor of the most competent members of the Society for a period of years at a time.

No one can fail to be grateful for the labors of our predecessors in this regard, but there is a simpler method which might perhaps be adopted without tying up the publication funds, and, what is more important, without mortgaging the intellectual income of the Society, its power for historical work for some time to come. The publication of the Bradford and Winthrop histories in an authentic text and exact transcription would be in itself a great service. I have a keen interest in both these works; I have read them, excerpted from them, and tried to make them available to others, but I am constrained to admit that I do not own the Winthrop, because I never felt that I could afford to pay the price now asked for the Savage edition. I have Bradford in the official Massachusetts edition, but I did not buy it; it came through the courtesy of a member of the Legislature. Would it not be possible for this Society to publish these texts for the present without notes, so as to furnish a standard edition which can be bought at a low price by libraries and especially by students? Can we not trust our successors to furnish the apparatus of learning necessary to make these two authors plain?

One argument for the plan of the Council is undoubtedly

very strong: these two works are not the peculiar property or pride of Massachusetts; they are American classics. Massachusetts has the peculiar honor of having given the opportunity for the writing of these two works; and the Massachusetts Historical Society has the duty of issuing, as the result of the highest scholarship, authentic texts of books which are the gift of the Commonwealth to the nation. The real question is, how far it is desirable for the Society to engage its funds and its time for issuing in a new and elaborate form works of which there are already two editions. Would not the publication of the texts be sufficient for this time? If the Society continues in its accustomed path, new possibilities will arise for the publication of new manuscripts which are as yet not accessible in print.

Remarks were also made by Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, D.D., Rev. EDMUND F. SLAFTER, D.D., Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR, and Hon. WINSLOW WARREN; and in closing, the PRESIDENT further said that the points made by Mr. Scudder did not commend themselves to his judgment, nor, he thought, to that of the Council. Upon one matter he wished to be explicit. He did not understand Mr. Scudder to suggest an expurgated edition of Bradford or of Winthrop to be published by this Society, any more than he would be likely to suggest an expurgated edition of the Scriptures to be published by a Bible Society, or of Shakespeare by a Shakespearian Society. It was, however, the belief of the Committee that editions of one thousand copies each of Bradford and Winthrop, published in their entirety on the plan proposed, would be absorbed within a reasonable time; but, unquestionably, to effect the absorption of that number of copies, it would be necessary to bring the fact and character of the editions to the notice of public libraries, collectors, and students, — and they alone purchase works of this sort, — through the usual, well-understood publishing machinery. Now, as was proposed eighty years ago, a “prospectus” must be issued and brought to the attention of those likely to purchase copies, at once elaborate and expensive, of works like Bradford and Winthrop. This, and this only, was contemplated; and, as he thought, most properly contemplated. As to the general public, it had not been taken into consideration; to supply it

with reading matter hardly falling within the province of this Society. The scheme looked, purely and exclusively, to libraries, collectors, and students,—a much more considerable class now than in 1826 or in 1853. So far as printing the text alone of Winthrop was concerned,—that of Bradford, owing to the late publication of it by the Commonwealth, not being in question,—the President said he could only for himself express the regret he should feel at seeing the Society, now or hereafter, fall in any respect below the high standard of scholarship and investigation heretofore set for it by its representatives in the last generation,—Mr. Savage and Mr. Deane. Any editions of either or both of those two classics to which this Society set its hand and name should, he thought, be of a character in which it could feel an enduring pride.

The whole matter was then recommitted to the Council.

The President then announced the death of Samuel Eliot, LL.D., a Resident Member, who died at his summer home in Beverly, September 14, 1898,¹ and called on Rev. Dr. SLAFTER, who spoke in substance as follows:—

MR. PRESIDENT,—Called upon unexpectedly, what I have to say must be desultory, brief, and incomplete. Dr. Eliot graduated at Harvard College, I think in 1839. He soon after went abroad, and passed some time in foreign travel. After he returned from Europe, he built or purchased a cottage on the borders of Brookline, and became a member of St. John's Church, Jamaica Plain, of which I was at that time the Rector. Mr. Eliot at once threw himself into the interests of the parish. He offered to give instruction to any class of young people, if there were such in the parish, who could be profited by his aid. He took charge of the music, organized a choir, played the organ, and held weekly sessions for practice and training in the music of the Church. I mention this because it was early in his career, and illustrates what was characteristic of him to the end of his life. He was always ready to do whatever lay within the sphere of his influence to improve and elevate all classes of men, morally, physically, intellectually, and religiously.

¹ Mr. Eliot was first elected into the Society March 10, 1853; and his membership terminated by his removal from the State, June 24, 1856. He was re-elected April 20, 1865, and but for the break in his membership he would have been at the time of his death the Senior Member.

Dr. Eliot appears never to have desired to enter any of the learned professions. On my first visit to him in his attractive little cottage in Brookline, he told me that he was neither rich nor poor, and that he intended to pursue no profession except that of the scholar. To this purpose he adhered. He was, I think, at that time writing his history of Liberty, which appeared first in two thick octavo, and subsequently in four octavo volumes of about four hundred pages each, the first two treating of the "Ancient Romans," the last two of the "Early Christians." Had this work first appeared to-day it would doubtless have had a much wider reading, as a vastly greater interest in historical studies has been awakened in the last forty years.

Dr. Eliot occupied numerous important official positions. He was connected with Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, for the period of eighteen years, eight years as Professor of History and Political Science, and ten years as Lecturer on Constitutional Law and Political Science, three years of which period he was President of the College. After his return to Massachusetts he was for some time Superintendent of the Public Schools of the City of Boston, Head Master of the Girls' High School, and a member of the School Committee. Whether he held these offices in the order of time in which I have mentioned them, I know not. In all these different official relations he discharged his duty with eminent satisfaction. I have never known a pupil who had been under his instruction, who did not speak of him as a teacher with unqualified admiration and gratitude.

Dr. Eliot was especially distinguished as a public speaker. His style was simple, direct, clear, and persuasive, with no expletives and rarely any superlatives. In the quality of his matter, in the graceful method of its presentation, in the quiet dignity of his presence, and the richness of his voice, he had, during the last years of his life, no peer in the city of Boston. I call to mind a few of the occasions when he delivered discourses which have been embalmed in print. An address before the Episcopal Charitable Society, a venerable institution, limited to a hundred members, established as early as 1724; an oration before the city authorities of Boston on the Fourth of July, 1868; a paper read before the Seventh Church Congress in Providence, Rhode Island; an address in Commemo-

ration of the Hon. William Appleton, the founder of St. Stephen's Chapel in Boston; an address at St. Paul's School in Concord, New Hampshire; an address on the Centennial of Washington's Inauguration, delivered in Christ Church, Boston; an address at the dedicatory service of the new school building of St. Mark's School, Southborough, Massachusetts; a eulogy on the Rt. Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D.; a memorial address on Dr. George Cheyne Shattuck, the founder of St. Paul's School in Concord, New Hampshire; an address at Trinity College on his inauguration as President; "Early Relations with the Indians," a discourse in the course, at the Lowell Institute, by members of the Massachusetts Historical Society. These constitute only an incomplete list of the discourses which he delivered on public occasions. Besides these public addresses, we must not fail to mention his "Biography of Montgomery Ritchie"; his "Paper on Civil Service Reform," in the publications of the American Social Science Association; and his "Manual of United States History," a bulky twelvemo, which passed through several editions.

Dr. Eliot held many important trusts. He was a trustee and member of the executive committee of the Museum of Fine Arts; president of the Boston Athenæum; president and trustee of the Massachusetts Bible Society; president of the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts School for the Blind, and doubtless some others. With all these institutions he identified himself in a warm, unflagging, practical interest. He was a conscientious, broad-minded, large-hearted, and efficient worker in every good cause which appealed to the conservative philanthropist or the devout Christian. I fear it will be long before the place made vacant by his death can be adequately filled.

Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, D.D., said:—

The services which Mr. Eliot rendered from time to time to our Society entitle him to our thanks and to grateful recollection. They indicate his interest in the study of history, which he showed through his life. At one time there seemed a promise and prospect that he would devote his whole life to these studies for the promotion of which our Society exists. It proved that his action and never-tiring eagerness to serve other men led him into vocations the demands of which cut

off his career as an historian. But the publications of his early life justify me in saying that in that change from his early plans we lost valuable work in the line he loved, — a line for which his early training gave him remarkable advantages.

He graduated at Cambridge in the class of 1839. He loved study, and he attacked each and all the subjects then studied at Cambridge with eager assiduity. In an English university he would have been said to have “gone in on both sides,” and to have won equal honors in mathematics and in the languages. He was a devoted student, he had a broad interest in all subjects which are worthy of man, and he was a pupil as much beloved by Benjamin Peirce, the head of mathematics, as he was by Felton, the professor of Greek literature, and by Longfellow, his intimate friend, at the head of the department of modern literature.

His classmates felt a certain regret that he did not enter at once on some advanced course of a literary career. But his health was such that at that time his friends feared the effects of sedentary life. He was born of a family of far-seeing men of affairs, and in the Class-book he says that he and his friends had doubted whether he should even enter college. From the Class-book it would seem that he always intended to pursue what is called a business career. Even the comparative freedom of his life in a counting-room did not wholly relieve the anxiety felt as to his health, and he left Boston in 1841 to spend the winter in Madeira for the benefit of the climate. From Madeira he went to Europe, and remained there for four years.

In Rome he conceived the idea of his “History of Liberty.” It was as Gibbon, years before, had there conceived his plan of the “History of the Decline of the Empire.” The History of Liberty, and the demonstration that as Right asserts itself in human affairs Liberty asserts herself as well, appealed to the young American’s enthusiasm. The first preface to the first two volumes of his work, “Liberty among the Romans,” shows this enthusiasm in a charming way. He made some preparatory studies for his work in Europe. On his return to America he diligently followed his plans. Two volumes, “Passages from the History of Liberty,” were published in Boston in 1847, and two more on “The Liberty of Rome” in New York in

1849. A revised edition, called "The Ancient Romans," was published in Boston in 1853. Part II. of "The History of Liberty" is "The Early Christians," also published in 1853. His own plan of this book embraced five parts. The three which were never finished were "The Papal Ages," "The Monarchical Ages," and "The American Nation."

Had Mr. Eliot lived in an older world than ours, we have every reason to suppose that he would have gone on in the plan which he thus laid out for himself. But time failed him, as he embarked on the torrent of American life, in his readiness to do the duty which came next his hand, and in the determination to do well what his service to the public demanded. In such service he established in Boston a charity school for vagrant children, he collected classes of young workingmen whom he instructed gratuitously. Trinity College at Hartford called him to be her professor of history and political science, and after four years in this service he became the president of that college. He remained in Hartford, I think, nearly ten years. He returned to Boston about 1870, and in Boston was the head master of the Girls' High School for four years, and afterwards Superintendent of the Boston public schools from 1878 for two or three years. He was an Overseer of Harvard College from 1866 to 1872, being one of the first list of Overseers chosen by the graduates under the present constitution of the college. The gentlemen whose names precede his in that list are Nathaniel Thayer, William Gray, James Freeman Clarke, and Darwin Erastus Ware, to the last of whom we owe the establishment of this admirable plan.

Mr. Eliot was made Doctor of Laws by Columbia in 1863, and by his own college in 1880. He was a Fellow of the American Academy, and from 1868 to 1872 was President of the American Social Science Association. His contributions to our Society while he was an active member were frequent and valuable, illustrating his accurate judgment and delicate taste. The most important of them was the lecture on the early relations between the Massachusetts Company and the Indians, for the course of Lowell Lectures delivered in 1869.

Such studies, however, became more and more the recreations of an active man of public spirit, who with every year of his life took new duties in the public service. Mr. Eliot became an active member of the Board of Trustees of the Massachusetts

General Hospital, of the Trustees of the State School for the Feeble-minded, of the Perkins Institution for the Blind; and to the daily work of these institutions he gave the invaluable inspiration of his life, and that careful administrative faculty which has so distinguished his family in many generations. There has been no man in Boston in the last twenty years to whom Boston has been indebted for so many services of a public character, in the amelioration of the condition of the unfortunate or in the education of the ignorant.

After a few remarks by Mr. EDWIN P. SEAVER, Mr. Henry W. Haynes was appointed to write a memoir of Mr. Eliot for publication in the Proceedings.

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN communicated some extracts from the Note-Book of Rev. John Fiske, and said:—

Some years ago I came into the possession of a Note-book kept by the Rev. John Fiske during his several pastorates at Salem, Wenham, and Chelmsford. From the time of his arrival here from England, in the year 1637, Mr. Fiske was living in Salem till about 1641, when he went to Wenham, and later became the first minister of the church gathered there on October 8, 1644. His third child, Moses (H. C. 1662), was born at Wenham on April 12, 1642, and baptized at Salem in the following June. The record of this son's birth seems to show that the father was living at Wenham two or three years before his settlement in that town as the pastor. In 1655 Mr. Fiske removed to Chelmsford, where also he was the first minister, and remained there until the day of his death on January 14, 1676-7.

The entries in the book relate almost wholly to cases of church discipline within the membership, to church meetings where theological matters were brought up and discussed, and to ecclesiastical councils held in the neighborhood, together with a sprinkling of baptisms, and names of persons admitted to the Covenant. They cover a period of time extending from the year 1637 to July 25, 1675, eighteen months before his death. In regard to genealogical or historical facts,—and these are the items most wanted to-day,—the entries are singularly meagre, and give us but little of either interest or value. The theology of those early times in New England may be as important now as then, but it is not so highly prized.

The old manuscript, however, brings down to us the details of many matters of ecclesiastical polity which in their day were deemed vital by the founders of our Puritan Commonwealth.

The pages of the book are about $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $7\frac{1}{2}$ in dimensions, and they number 344 (or 172 leaves), of which 48 pages are blank, or nearly so. The book opens with the Covenant of the Church of Christ at Salem, which is followed by 178 names, though not autograph signatures. Owing to a bad tear through three of the leaves, and the consequent loss of a part of the writing, a portion of the text and some of the names are gone. The first twenty-five pages have been printed in the "Historical Collections of the Essex Institute" (I. 37-44) for May, 1859; and the part there given is a fair sample of the rest. This printed copy also shows what portion of the text and how many names are missing in the original manuscript. Near the beginning of the book, immediately following the Salem records, sixteen leaves have been torn out, which presumably were blank, but the stubs still remain.

The handwriting is very hard to read, and contains many abbreviations and nondescript characters which it is impossible to represent in type. At that period of time it was very common for ministers to have some knowledge of short-hand writing; and in the Note-book certain words and syllables are indicated by arbitrary signs, the same as were used in stenography. In the copy here given of certain extracts, such abbreviations and characters for the most part have been spelled out in full. When Mr. Fiske began his pastorate at Wenham, he turned the book over and made his entries at the other end of the volume, and thus continued them even during his settlement at Chelmsford.

Mr. Fiske, while at Chelmsford, prepared a Catechism (Cambridge, 1657) for the use of children, which was printed at the expense of the town. Copies of this little tract are now excessively rare, and probably not more than one or two remain in existence. A good specimen is preserved in the Lenox Library, New York. For a bibliographical description of the pamphlet, see the Proceedings (second series, IX. 411, 412) of this Society for February, 1895. At that period there were, perhaps, a dozen or fifteen other places in New England which had published similar catechisms for the religious instruction of the young. In all towns it was the custom to assemble

the children often, and, under the direction of the minister, to catechise them on matters connected with their spiritual welfare.

The following extracts from the Note-book relate to this early custom as practised in Chelmsford, which was then a fair representative town of the times. These entries throw a good deal of side-light on the bringing up of youth in those days, and they also allude incidentally to certain interesting facts connected with the publication of Mr. Fiske's Catechism. During that period, throughout New England, the education of the young in some respects may have been sombre, but it was sturdy and homespun in its fibre, and brought out the marks of manhood and womanhood.

27 of 4 [1646] concluded in the Church that the 3d. d. of week at time the laws goe forth the childrē to cō forward to be catechized & to giue account of what they learnd of the s'm sab. before. to pasto's house . . .

& togethr heerewithal in the 4 place of the refusall (as we vnderstood). to disburse their pportion to the Catech. printing, wch the Ch: stands engaged to see satisfied.¹ . . .

23 of 10 58 Voted by the Church that the 33^{shs} 9^d wch the Church stood engagd to see pd to Br. James Parker for the Catechises should be for p'snt lent to him out of the Church stock. & if light app hraftē to the Church where it lies behind, to be taken in to the deacos hand on the account of the catechizes in lew of this loane if not light, then this pte of the Church stock to be here leyed in his hands as assignd to the dischrg of this debt of the Church. . . .

6 of 12 64 A Church meeting Catechizing. Agreed by the Church. that the sã course of catechizg of all under 16. yeers old. be attended at the house of the pastō. viz. for mayds the day aftē the Lecture. & for youths the 2d. day of the weeke following the lecture.

It[em] That for all yong men aboue 16. yeers old, vnmarryd. That it be moved, who will voluntarily app to giue in their Names to Answr in publick. & for such as shall decline: if Children of the Church. that the Church shall see that they attend to be catechisd by the pasto, in his House upon the 2d. day of the week monthly aftē the lecture at the usual time, of meeting (viz. aboute 3 of the clock in afrnoone & if

¹ From a letter written by Mr. Fiske to Esdras Read, under date of January 31, 1657-8, and copied into the Note-book.

they shall negl. to come on one day, to bring as much the next time, as may pportion the Time. This vottd.

That we begin the worke in publ. about the begining of 2^d month
The Catechases to be dēd out by Bro. Kemp at 6^d p peece. . . .

30. of 4. 69 The Church mett . . .

After this. It was pposed the way of Catechising frō house to house.
& the yong or vnmarried psos to meet at sō one house of 4 or 5. the
maryed to be visitd in their owne houses

In the Note-book Mr. Fiske gives many interesting facts connected with the removal of his church from Wenham to Chelmsford. In September, 1654, the proposal for the change came from certain brethren who spoke for the Chelmsford church. Various meetings were held by the Wenham church in order to consider the subject; and after much deliberation the matter was referred to Governor Endicott and five other prominent men for their counsel. These persons favored the plan, and recommended the proposed removal, which was carried out during the autumn of 1655. In the early history of the Colony there were several other similar instances where churches migrated in a body. At this late day all the causes leading up to such changes are not clear, but it is probable that local dissensions were closely connected with them.

I have copied the various entries in regard to births, baptisms, etc., which will be of service to genealogical students. I have also given the action taken by the Chelmsford church in regard to the removal of three families to the neighboring town of Groton in the year 1662, in order to show the great formality attending their separation from that body. No church had then been gathered at Groton, and perhaps the want of religious instruction there may explain the reluctance of the Chelmsford members to have their brethren remove thither, and live so far away from the sanctuary of the Lord. I have also copied several other matters of interest, one of which is the expression of the church when Mr. Fiske's son, Moses, was about to leave home and go to college. Previous to his departure for Cambridge, he appeared before the members and owned the Covenant, and made public vows that he would be true to the church.

A few of the names found in these pages are not given by

Mr. Savage in his Genealogical Dictionary, but some of the facts herein mentioned are stated by him, — for instance, the date of the baptism of Mr. Fiske's son, Moses, and that of his second daughter, Anna, which must have come originally from this old manuscript. I am inclined to think that Mr. Savage never saw the Note-book, but probably Mr. Felt had used it, and may have furnished him with some of the facts therein found.

THE CHILDREN OF JOHN & ANNA FISKE

Born in N. E.

1638 John. borne the 29th of 6^t }
bapt. the 2^d of 7. } Salem m^r Pet's

Escaped a g^rte danger at wenhã, in passing with the streame vnd^r the mill wheele, when the mill was a goeing. An. 1647. 6^t of 3^d at what time he recei^d (as twere) a new life. not a bone broke &c.

1640 Sarah. borne 24. of 5^t }
bapt. 26^t of 5. } Salem. m^r pet

1642. Moses. borne 12 of 2^d at Wenhã
bapt. 0— of 4^t at Salem¹ by m^r Norice

1644 Anna. borne 15^t of 11th

1645 ——— baptised 2. of 1st (the 1st child bapt. at } Wenham

1646. Eli-ezer. borne 8^t of 12th }
bapt. 15. of 12. } Wenham.
he Deceased 16. of 10. 49.)

1671. The sd. Anne Fiske wife to the sd. Jn^o fiske haueing liued with him about 37. yeers. deceased 14. of 12th.^{mo} at Chelmsford.

1672. Elizabeth Hinksmã [widow of Edmund] marryed to the sd. Jn^o fiske 1. of 6.^{mo} at Chelmsford. . . .

2^d of 1st 45.

This day, being Lords day, the Seale of Baptisme was Administred in this Church, the 1st time the Church had the seale Administd wch by reason of the season, 1 sab: before the Church being constrynd to meete in o^r pastors house: & now a 2^d time, (w^{ch} was continued the Church meeting there 2 or 3. Sab: after.)

The Church memb^r Baptised, was Anna Fiske daught^r to John Fiske Pastor. . . .

On one Lo: day in this interl. in the 4^t.^{mo} John Moulton Baptised.

¹ The date of this baptism is not clear. The record was made, probably, at a later time, and perhaps then Mr. Fiske had forgotten the exact date.

On Lo : day. 6^t m^o. we had the seals of the Supp & also the seale of Bapt. Samuel Fiske, & Sarah Geere Baptised. . . .

Mary Herse baptisd. 3^d mo. 46 . . .

this d. being sab. Benjamin fairefeild the sone of g. fairefeild & his wife of Salem Baptised 27 of 4. . . .

Br. Rich dodge of the Church of Salem had a child baptisd here . . .

Baptised. Eliezer Fiske the son of John Fiske & Anna his wife	} 15 of 12 46..
Baptised. Sarah Norton the daughter of Geo: Norton	

Ephraim Geere baptisd. 17 of 2^d [1647] . . .

this day Elizabeth Moulton daughter of br. Ja. Moulto &c Baptised.
9 of 5. 47

this day Joseph Batcheler the son of Sister Batcheler (& bro. Joseph Batcher deceased in month 1st) baptised. 22. of 6. 47 . . .

Joseph the son of W^m Fisk & Bridget his wife Baptised. 21 of 3^d [1648] . . .

15. of 8 or thrabouts Mary the daught^r of Rich. & Mary Goldsm. Baptisd

29. of 8 or thrabts. the wife of John Shiply Receivd into Cov^t. hauing made hr relation & declared hrselfe as. the opinion of the wo: of Eli. honrd she had ben taken with them & the mattr in qu. before the Church being cleared. & laye Test. coming fr Sale^m divrs of the Church besids the Elds on hr behalfe.

abt a 3 week after hr 3. children John. Nath. & Lidia Baptisd

abt this Time Joseph the sō of Rich Dodge & his wife baptisd . . .

14 of 5^t 50. Sarah the daughter of Bro: Goldsm. & his wife baptisd...

Vpon 4 of 7th 1654 was dated a L^r vnder the hands of Rob^t Fletcher, Tho: Adams, W^m Fletcher, W^m Buttereck in the nã of the rest, engaged in the N. plantation at Chelmsford. whrin the pastō with the rest of this church at Wenham were Invited

This L^r being aftrwrds conveyed to vs by the hands of Isa: Lernet & Tho: Adams. was cōicated to the church. & a Liberty by the Major pte graunted so far to attend the pvidence: as to pmit the pastor to Goe ouer & see the place

accordingly a day was set of meeting at Chelmsford. & thrupō the messengers returned

Vpon the sd. day set divrs of the Brethren accompanied the pastō ouer vnto Chelms. where the comittee & divers others were p^rsnt a view was taken of the place. The Brethren p^rsnt satisfied themselves aboute there accommodations. & pposalls were then made to the pastō for his accommodation & yeerely mayntenance. as to be tendred vnto

him by consent of the whole num̃ of Inhabitants & in their nã by the Committee

These pposales were pmised, with their furthr request to be taken into consideratiō, & in sō short seasō after the Returne an Answer & resolution to be sent by Br. Spalding, as at his coming ouer.

After this Returne of the pastor & Brethren upon the 10th of 8^{mo} 54 the resolution & engagm^t of divrs of the Brethren was in the face of the whole church, at a Church meeting concluded upō whras 5. absolutely engaged. 2 conditionally & in word only, refusing at p^snt to subscribe their hands. yet after sent their Engagem^{ts} psonally by Bro: Spalding, so as the greater number of the Church now stood engaged, in case the pasto^r engaged also

Vpon 6^t of 9^{mo} the pasto^r Sent his Engagm^{ts} by Bro: Spalding & his Resolutiō, as Respecting the engag^t of so many Brethren as s^d.

Thus the matter Lay dormant as twere all winter till the 1st m^o. 55. at what time Bro: Read coming ouer enformed us in such wise here at Wenhã, as thrvpō both the P. & the sd engaged Brethren demurred upō the pceedings & some th^t had sold heere at Wenhã, redeemed their accomodations agayne into their possession

& a L^r. was sutably sent by Br. Read to acquainte the Chelmesf. Comittee how things stood, & advisd to stead themselves elsewhere.

Betwene this time & the 6^t of 4th mo 55. things hung vncertayne & vncleered, notwithstanding some L^{rs}. passed & some agitatiō at Wenhã betwene Isa: Lernet agent fr Chelmsfd & Wenhã Brethren. But as upō 6^t of 4th aforesd was dated a L^r. & sent by the hands of Isa: Lernet Sim: Thompsō & Tho: Adams. with full powr to them to treate & finally to determine ths busines depending betwene both pties.

Vpon there coming ouer to Wenham. The Matter was determined betwene them & the sd. pasto^r touching the Building of the house Terms of Accommodation & of yeerly mayntenance., as under there hands affixed to the L^{rs} was sent before dated in first month tenth day.

likewise it was concluded betwene them & the Brethren at Wenham to refer the matter to Counsell; & the pties agreed upon were. M^r Endicot Govrno^r M^r Mather, M^r Allen of Dedhã. M^r Cobbet. M^r Shermã. Capt. Johnsō. of Woobuerne who determined the case for Chelmsford.

This case thus determined: on either side p^rpation was made for the Removal of the Church.

Accordingly about the 13th of 9^{mo} 55. there were met at Chelmsfd. the pasto^r with the engaged Brethren of Wenham church viz. Ezdras Read, Edw. Kemp. Austin Killam. Sa: Foster. Geo: Byam & Rich. Goldsmith. seauen in all To whom such of the Brethren of Wooburne & Concord ch: who had before ppounded themselues to joyne with the ch:

late at Wenham, Now in Removeing to Chelmsford. & p^resented themselves. with there L^{rs} of Dismission: upon satisfaction & Testimony Giuen were by an vnanimous vote Received into fellowship They being the greater numb. in way of mutual compliance, a Relatiō passd on either side, as each one voluntarily would:

		mem ^{rs} sig ^d
Viz.	Isaack Lernet	(he dyed 8. of 10. 57. 1
	Simon Thompson	(he dyed about 3 q ^{rs} of a y. 2
		after at Ooburne
	W ^m Vnderwood	3
	Abram Parker.	4
	Benja: Butterfeild	5
	Tho: Chamberlin	6
Next received		
	Dan. Blogged who brought l ^r of dismission from the	7
	Ch: at Cambridge	

So after this the seales of the supp administred & there were admitted by vote these Members of other churches, to cōion with us in these seales.

	Mr Griffin	
	W ^m fletcher & his wife	
	Tho: Adams) & his wife	
	Br. Vnd ^r woods wife	
	(Edw. Spalding)	
	Bro: Butterfeilds wife	
	Bro: Chamberlins wife	
	Edm: Chamberlins wife	
	Abram Parkers wife	
	Jos. Parkers wife	
	Isa: Lernets wife	
	Sim: Thompsons wife	
since Rec ^d	into fellowship was Jacob Parker	8
		9
It[em].	Tho: Adams. & Edw. Spalding . on 27 of 2 ^d 56	10

Children Baptised

Isaack Lernets child viz. Isaack Lernet
 Abr. Parkers child. viz. Mary. Parker
 Jos. parkers wiues child. viz. Anna Parker
 Dan Bloggeds child viz. Anna Blogged
 Bro: Vnderwoods child viz. Samuel. Vnderwood
 Tho: Adams child viz. Edith Adams

3 children of Jacob parkers viz. { Jacob.
 on 19 of 2d. 56. { Sarah.
 { Thomas.

Vpon 27th of 2^d. Serj. Hildrick of the ch : of Cambr. received vnto the seale of the supp as a memb of the Church.

It. ppounded to the Ch : this day. to consider about the choyse of some to the worke of the Deacon.

Vpon 11. of 4. 56. a publick g^{ra}l fast

In the close of the day was the Church Cov^t renewed repeated & voted by the Brethren.

It[em] there were received into o^r cov^t pfessing their willingness to owne that o^r cov^t. as had ben exp^rssed

- | | | | |
|----|--|---|---------------|
| 11 | William Fletcher | } dismissed
fro the Church
of Concord | |
| 1 | Bro : Adams his wife | | Mary Adams. |
| 2 | Bro. Vndrwoods wife | | Sara Vndrwood |
| 3 | Anna Butterfeild the wife of Bro : Butterfeild | | |
| 4 | Mary Chamberlin the wife of Bro : Tho : Chamblin | | |
| 5 | Mary Lernett the wife of Bro : Isaack Lernet | | |
| 6 | Mary Thompsō the wife of Bro : Symō Thōson | | |
| 7 | Rose parker the wife of Bro : Abrā Parker | | |
| 8 | Margaret Parker. the wife of Joseph parker | | |
| 9 | Mary Chamberlin, the wife of Edmond chamblin | | |

dismissed to us frō the Church of Ooburne.

Edmond Chamblin the sō of the l. sd. Mary Chamblin baptised 29 of 4 56. This d. the Lo : supp & here cōicatd with vs. Rob. Proctor of Concord

Rafe Hill & his wife } of ooburne
Geo : Farly }

W^m Baker of the Church of charlestowne

This day agreed by the Church that the officer should repeate & declare the Relation of the wo : to the Church :

Also. That when any such psō as haue ben yet no memb to any Church congregated orderly ppounds himself the sã be ppounded to the Church p^rvately, Testimony concerning their life & convsation be enq^red into, sd psos be assigned to be joynd with the officer the day set & libty for any othr the brethren or sisters to be p^rsent at the first Tryall.

6 of 5 56. Agreed that next Lo : day the Bre. should bring in ther votes by pap for the nōiation of one Deacō he that had the greater num̃ of votes to haue the 1st place in nōiatiō & in case the Church agreed not aboute him, then in the 2^d place, the 2^d next & so forth.

& in case the ch. came to a joynt agreem^t about one, then that one accepting of the call to haue the libty of nōiating a 2d.

It. Testim. this day was giuen touching Jo : Nutting & his wife who had propounded themselves to o^r fellowship. viz. Isa : Lernet Sim. Thomson Abram Parker.

13 of 5. 56. Isaack Lernet was chosen as afforesd to officiate the office of a Deacō by way of probation aduised to leaue the place of a serjant as too gr̃te a brden to retayne bth that & this too. & at the end of $\frac{1}{2}$ the yeere. he to be p̃posed to the Church for officer.

After sō Agitation, & modest refusal at 1st, he was psuaded to accept of it, wch he doeing desired withall the prayers of the Church

It was left with him at his libty to nōiate a 2d to be joynd with him upon next Lo: day. wch if upō consideration here they should refuse, the Church then to be in a readines by pap vots as before to bring in for nōiatiō. & the p̃ceeding aftrwd to be as before, In the absense of the p̃sō nōiated to discusse the matter, & in case of a closure, to p̃ceed accordingly

Before this choyse of Is: Lernet to a Decons place, (whose wrke was declared to lye in taking care & p̃viding by all due just & lawfull outward meanes the supporting & continuing of the Ordin: to the Church)

There was Joynd to the Church

Joh: Nutting after his Relation made

assent manifested to the p̃fession & cov^t of the Church

It. Jo: Nuttings wife. hr relation being repeated by the officer of the Church.

20 of 5. 56 The qu. being put upō what account the Church p̃ceed to a new election. there being 2 brethren w^{ch} had officiāt^d by a call of the Church of wenhã in that place p̃sent, & not put out, by any cause alledged.

Vpon this Bro: Lernet decline the call, as quering the openes of it

1. It ansrwd that the Church p̃ceeded to this way as resoluing it this day forthnight, that twas upō mutuel agrement betwene the Church & them the brethren frely laying downe

& Bro: Read ag: this day exp^{ssd} himself both to lay downe & also to decline to accept of the call, if he shld be desired & called, fō sō Reasons by him alledged.

Bro: Kemp likewise lay downe & consnt to for sake of the p^rmises

It referrd to next Lo: day to agitate & ripen for a vote whithr Bro: Fletcher haugeing o^r vots of noiation or Bro: Kemp. for 6^{mo} shall cō unanislly to be pitcht upon

This Lo: day Bro: Bloggeds wife p̃pounded to the Church 27 of 5.

It Bro: W^m fletcher chosen by g^uāl vote to occupy the place of a Deacō with Bro: Lernet. & accepted it

Bro: Kemp also by silent consent, after so agitatiō occasioned. by a p^rtended case of conscience put by him how he could lay downe his place without sō reflection upō his good Name, was p̃mitted by the Church to continue the place upō probation. [In margin] Deacons pbationary elected Isaack Lernet W^m Fletcher Edw. Kemp.

it gaue occasion of examining the principles we went upō vnto a new choyse.

& found this as by the acknowl^d of many Brethren.

1 that the Church of wenhā vpō the Remoue hither, not haueing any Deacons in office, did refer the matter to a n. choyse, so as the Brethr. of Chelm: being the grter num^b might equally with them haue satisfaction thrin, as enjoying the li^bty with them. as was manifest at the coming up; upō the receiuing in the Chelmsf. Brethr. into the Cov^t.

& that by comō consent Br: Kemp was to be continued untill the spring, when they together shld pceed to a new election & this by Br: Kemp consntd th^to.

Also that this day 3 week Br. Read & Bro: Kemp both consnted to the Church^s pceeding in that way.

likewise this day forthnight they acted with the Church in the choyse of Bro: Lernet.

likewise this day seuenight they both ag. declared themselves to lay downe & to pceed with the Church

this day also Bro: Read fvlly declared himself before the election pceeded. but Bro: Kemp seing wch way the election would worke ag declared himself as before. wch causd sō pplexaty in o^r pceedings more the vanity of experimting till what time twas concluded as sd.

Three of John Nuttings children Baptised	{ John.
	{ James. 3 of 6. 56
	{ Mary.

Test. cā in of the conuersation of Bro: Bloggeds wife, such as wch was satisfactory. & the 3^d day set for the Tryal & examination. this day the seales of the supp [In margin] 10. of 6. Br: Bloggeds wife

The wife of Bro: Blogged admitted into the Church Cov^t & fellowship. 17 of 6^t

The letts dimissory for James Parker frō the Church of ooburne were red & he making his Relation &c & Testifying his assent to o^r Church pfessiō was admitted into o^r Covt. 24. of 6^t

24 of 9th 56 Sister fletcher p^rsenting hr 1st of dismissiō frō Concord Church was admitted to the Cov^t of this Church.

1s^t of 11th 56 This day a Church meeting agreed upō Lo: day before. (whrin there being absent these Brethren viz. Adams Read Vnd^rwood Blogged. Foster. he being detynd by illness

24. of 11 the Church p^rsent concluded of these following ppositions w^{ch} had ben before for Aboute a q^r of a yeere from time to time still in agitation.)

1 of 11. 56 & voted vnanimously the forme. In the forme as follows

Children of
the Church. }

We do conceiue

1. That all they that are in Ch: Cov^t are ch: members.
- 2 That Bapt. (being the initiation seale of the Cov^t) belongs of right to all such.

(These two were voted by the whole Church the Lords day seuennight before.

1 of 11. 56

And this day the Church pceeded in the rest as followes

- 3 That the Children of Church members, vnder the age of 14 or 15. y. when there pñts tooke the Cov^t are included in there pñts Cov^t & to be reputed members, & consequently to be Baptised, not haueing ben before Baptised.
4. That the Ch: is not bound to extend her inspection & care oũ them: & as they grow to exceed the s^d yeeres, to exercise ch: discipline towards them, in case of their being Scandalous.
- 5 That the Church is likewise bound in pursuance of this her care ouer them, to stir them up to acquaint themselves betimes with God & with his will, & accordingly to get the knowledge of the Principles of Religiõ & to avoyd scandall in there Liues
- 6 That such of these as being vnder the Age of 14 or 15 yeeres, shall behaue themselves Scandalously (as by Lying, filthy cõication, or othwise: shalbe responsible to the Ch: by there next pñts: as either there nãal pñts, or such as be in there stead (if of the Church)
- 7 That such of thes as haue attayned the knowl. & vnderstanding of the pñciples of Religiõ, & are without just scandall are to be Encouraged to lay hold on & to owne there pñts Cov^t psonally.
8. That such of these yonger Ones as haue once thus psonally Engagd in Cov^t may p'sent there Children to Baptisme, now in there right who are there next parents.
9. That notwithstanding the sd. yonger p'sons, should be in psonall Cov^t, & priviledged with the Baptisme of there children. as sd. yet as the case may require, The ch: may doe regularly to satisfy themselves touching there further fitnes ere they yeeld them the liberty, of ptakeing in the Lords Supp & of voteing in ch: affaires
10. That in Order to the Ch's satisfaction this way, A Confession of the faith, & a Relation of the manner of Gods working with there soules, may be required; euen of these.

Heereof L^{rs} to the Ch. at Concord & ooburne were determined to be sent to acquaint them with this.

Br. Adams made sō proposalls (to be sent also) wch for (ad-penepr^m)

1 of 12 56. Vpon this day the Brethren p^rsented their Childr, names & Ages as follow

1 Bro. Lernet	{	Mary about 10 y. old 15 of 5. 56
		Anna 8. yeere old 11 of 6. 56
		William 6. y. old 1. day 8. 56
		Sarah 4. y. old 15. of. 9. 56
		Isaack 2 y. old. 1. of 8. in y. 57.
		Benoni bapt. 17. of 10. 57.
2 Br. W ^m Fletcher at this time	{	John Bates aboute 15 y. old
		Josua Fletcher about 12 y. old
		Lidia. about 9 y. old
		Samuel about 4 y. old
		Paule aboute 2 y. old
2 Br. Th: Adams	{	Mary
		Jonathan
		Pelatiah
		Timothy
		Samuel
		Ædith.
4 Br. James Parker	{	Elizabeth 12 y. old 4. of 1 st 57
		Anna 10. y. old & 14 dayes.
		John 8. y. old & 12. dayes.
		James 5. y old about 15 of 2 ^d 57.
		Josiah 4. y. old & 4 months
		Samuel 6. m. old.
5 Br Abrah. Parker	{	Anna 11. y. old in 8 mo: 56.
		John 9. y. old in 8 mo. 56
		Abrahā 4. y. old in 6. mo. 56
		Mary 1. y. old in 9 ^{mo} 56.
Bro: Jacob Parker	{	Jacob. 4. y. old in 3 ^{mo} 56
		Sarah 2. y. old in 2 ^d mo. 56
		Thomas 1. y. old in 1 st mo. 57.
Br. Vnderwood	{	Remembrance about 15. y. old
		Sarah aboute 14. y. old
		Priscilla about 10 y. old
		Aquilla about 8. y. old.
		Deborah aboute 4 y. old.
		Samuel 1. y. old 1 ^{mo} 57

He on 17 of 5. 57
drowned. & on
18. of 5. bury-
ed. On the gñal
tryning day
he dyed, being
in washing.

- | | |
|--|---|
| S[ister]. Vnderwoods son | Tho: Pellet 22. y. old. |
| Bro. Tho Chamberlin. | { Anna about 20 y. old
Thomas. about 17. y. old
Samuel Chäblin aboute 10. y. old
Mary. about 6. y. old |
| The wife of Edmond Chamberlin | { Mary. about 8. y. old
Sarah about 7. y. old
Elisabeth about 5. y. old.
John aboute 3. y. old
Edmond about ½ a y. old |
| Bro. Benj. Butterfeild | { Benjamin aboute 20. y. old
Jonathan aboute 15. y. old
Nathaniel about 11½.
Samuel about 8. y. old
Joseph aboute 6. y. old. |
| Bro. Blogged | { Thomas 2. y. old on 24 of 11. 56.
Anna. 1. y. old on 2d of 9. 56.
Daniel Borne 7 of 11. 56. |
| Bro. Read. | { Bethiah aboute 19 y. old
Obadiah about 17. y. old |
| Bro. Spalding | { John about. 23 y. old
Edward aboute 21 y. old
Benjamin 14. y. old on 4 of 2 ^d . 56.
Joseph 10. y. old on 25 of 8. 56
Dinah 7. y. old on 14 of 1. 56.
Andrew 4 y. old on 19 of 9. 56 |
| Bro. Foster. | { Hannah about 7. y. old
Samuel aboute 6. y. old
Eli. aboute 3. y. old. |
| S[ister]. Shipley
who was admitted into
Cov ^t with this Church at
Wenhä 15. of 8. 48 | { John aboute 19. y. old
Nathaniel aboute 17. y. old
Lidia aboute 15. y. old |
| Bro: Nutting | { John 5. y. old 25 of 6 ^{mo} 56
James 3. y. old 30 of 4. 56.
Mary 1. y. old 10 of 11. 56 |
| Bro. Symō Thompsō | { Sarah 10. y. old on 25 of 12 56
James 7. y. old 15 of 1. 56
Mary. 5. y. old 9 of 11. 56.
Anna 1. y. old 30 of 5. 56. . . . |

William the Son of W^m Fletcher Baptised 8. of 1. 57

Elizabeth the Daughter of Rob. Procter baptised . . .

3^{mo} 57. Edward Foster The son of Sam : Foster Baptised.

[4th Mo.] In this month Edward Foster The sō of Sam : Foster baptised . . .

1. of 9^{mo} 57 Mary Parker the daughter of sister pker wife of Joseph pker Baptised . . .

Josiah Nutting This d. [date uncertain] Bro. Nuttings child baptised

Joseph Hildrick Some few week befor Br. Hildrick child

12 of 7 58. This day Moses Fiske, being suddenly to depte to the Colledge was called forth before the Church : & owned thr his followeth Cov^t in the face of the Church, psonally in cov^t engaging himself to the Church, & the Church to him, as in the forme as followes. [Here follows the covenant.] . . .

[13 of 12, 59] Sarah Nutting the daughter of Br. & Sister Nutting Baptised Zechariah pker the sō of Bro. Ja : pker Baptised . .

21 of 7. 60 Isaack Parkr the sō of Abrā Parker Baptised . . .

9 of 9 61 On this day. the 3 bre : Ja : parker, Ja : Fiske, Joⁿ Nutting ppounded to the Church. That they haueing some thoughts and inclinations to a Remoue, desired to ppound it to the Church, that (as they may see God to make way for them) they may haue the Churches loueing leaue so to doe, & their prayers for them, for a blessing of God upō there vndertakeings.

This being pposed by the pasto^r, he added that himself declined to speake ought in the case, one way or othr: but desired that the brethren might manifest themselves.

Br. Kemp. app^hending not any n̄ty of the remoue, wisd they would attend Gods call here.

Br. Ad : sd. twas a qu. whither the case wilbe resolued at p^rsent. as in r of the desire. [In margin] These as a brothr he declared

Twas replyed : that they being yet disingagd, had but the opportunity, as till the next 3^d day of the weeke, to giue in their Answr to Groton. & they desired an answr frō the Church by that time.

Br. Ad. furthr sd. they saw a call of God leading them to this place & if they app^hended a call of God away, twas nēy [necessary] they should giue an accōnt to the Church of their call hence.

Br. Chābl. p^rssed also, that they render to the Church their grounds

The pasto^r answrd. that if any one or 2 more did speake to that purpose, he would put it to the vote, to see if it now the Churchs mind they should giue their grounds : & if it app to be the mind onely of 2 or 3 brethr. He should heare them, to take p^rvate satisfaction.

Heereupō scarce a man in the Church, but p^rsently sd. the grounds, the grounds.

So the pastō desired the br : to approue their grounds

Br. parkr stepping up to speak. the pastō asked him, (he speaking in the plural numb) whithr he spake the grounds of them all there or only his owne : Answrd. tho they had each of them sō ptic. grounds of lesse: conseq. yet in the mayne they now all agreed. or to that effect.

& then sd. that he for his pte owned that God had a hand in bringing him hither : & he hoped he shold see the sã oŭruling hand of his, in his Remoue.

& as to their grounds, tis not their desire to exp'sse them in ptic, vnlese it shall be pticularly desired & urged Onely in gñal that it is bec. of sevrall things p'se upō their spits as in reference to Church Administration, & sō uncomfortable differences, as they all know are wonted to arise abt the sã ; & added, y^t if he could enjoy all ordin : or Administration, as according to Rule, as he apprehended, he for his pte would not remoue

Br. Fiske pfsd his assent. & added, y^t as his ends of coming were not knowne to God, & in sō measure to the Church, so it would be no smale thing that should moue him to a Remoue.

Heervpō much was sd by one & othr

& the pastor pceivd the matter to tend to much agitatiō moued for a Church meeting the following day

Br. Ad. (opposing the hearing of the grounds in ptic) haueing pposd, that it might be put to passe in the Church. whithr the deacōs of the Church, remayn such in the Church of Chelmsford, as there is no cause for these Br. upo that account to remoue

Br. par. Replied.

- 1 that the ppō for a voate seemed not according to a rule
2. that if their grounds might not be hrd, he hoped they would not make the Church a p'fer.

the pasto moved that the grounds might be considerd, considering it would also reflect vpo the Church. they were Bro: & eithr in an erro^r and mistake and they need to be holpen: or not, & then the Church need to considr it. & so p'ssd for a meeting next day

Bro. Ad. declined it & objecting ag it tooth & nayl, sd it tended to the breach of the Church: and we had no call of God to hear them.

Twice it was voted. 1 for a meeting at 10 a clock. & then all voted exept himself & one more: then at the motiō of br. Fletchr. at 9. a clock, & then 3 or 4 only dissntd

10 of 9 61. At this ch. meeting Br. Ad. Fl. & Chabl. absent rest p'sent. br. Chabl probably knew not of the meeting

At weh meeting. they p'fessed if the Church had ben all togethr, they would & had entended ingenuously to have agreed themselves. but seeing sō principal bro: and one as seems to them, purposely absent, they conceivd it their prudence rathr to decline the exprsing of

the grounds. in ptic than to give occasiō of any breach or divisiō in the Church

& as they remoue, for their owne peace sake, so they are unwilling to spring aught, (tho lying, as ned such greife upo their owne spits) as should tend to the breach of the place. It being p̄ssed by divers yesternight, that the Church is looked at to be in good state & union at p̄sent neithr was it the meaning to speak so, if they had spoken as to accuse the Church, or any ptic. p̄sos in the Church. but to haue seene what ease they could have obteynd to their owne spits.

Br. Nutting p̄posed one ground further in r of his one ptic. viz. the inconveniences of his p̄snt situation & that he could not help himself. for in remoueing to his remote accomodations, haueing sevrall smale childr, he should much dep̄ue himself or wife of the ordin: by that means. & sought rather the settling himself comfortably for the outward mā, nigh to the meeting house.

After much Agitation in the p̄sence and absence of the 3 brethren, they cā to this result for Answr.

That the case of the br. Remoue was doubtful to vs at p̄sent & we desidr furthr consideration of it so as if p̄uid: shall in meane time before they can heare futhr frō us, settle them in their p̄posed way, we shall leaue the Matter to God: if othrwise, by their leafe or othr p̄uid: they shalbe delayed, we shall be willing they shall hr furthr frō us, so soone as we shall resolue ōselues.

At this meeting also voted

1 that we should call upō Tho: Barret to know his reasos why he p̄secuted not his motion of Joyning in ō cov̄

2 that Jacob parker shld be joynd wth the pastō & deacⁿ in p̄vate Tryal

3. that in case he attend with a desire to p̄ceed, he shold be in-formd that tis the mind of the Church that he should w^h satisfy the Church for his vnbrothrly & treachers appearing at Concord Church. ag: this Church in bro: procters case, & that aft̄ himself had declared himself satisfied with the Church. so (proh dolor) the case is left. so

that in case these bre: they remoue. Suppose (as in charity to them) their plea Real A Bro: or Breth. haueing matter of Greife or offence vpo their C^s respecting ecclesiastical Administration: neithr they may be admitted into a capacity of becoming better informed, in case erroneous: nor the Church, nor any bro: in the Church, if under sin: of seeing their owne euil: & this sin shalbe smothered, & Conscience simply slighted!

23 of 10 61. A Church meeting appoytd upō occasiō of giving in the deacons Accounts. &c &c.

At weh meeting. it was agreed & vōtd that the Nōion of sō psō, to Officiet by way of pbatīō till Bro: parker remoues.

At this meeting there were p'sent 13 of the Church. Br. Fletcher went away at the begining. And absent were Br. Adams Br. Blogged Br. Ja: ffiske Br. Vanderwood.

& 1 it was argued whithr the Church might goe about so weighty a busines, without the rest of the Brethren, they not hauing notice of the busines.

& Twas Resolvd. 1. that their absence ought to be no hindrance to the Churchs pceedings, seeing they ought to haue been there. it being publickly agreed of.

2. that they absent could not be ignorant of Br. parkers Remoue, & of the nty of the consideration of a seasonable supply in his roome

3. that there is no rule obvious, that ties eithr the officer to moation beforehand all the occasions of a Church meeting; or for a Church, if occasion be offered of the consideratiō of sō new matter, & when they are together, to defer the determination throf at p'sent, bec. it was not eithr foreseene, or soe declared, as one reasō of the meeting

4. that where a Church meeting is by gñal consnt appoytd, & publickly knowne: that they that doe meete haue the powr of trans-acting & defering matters, as a Church of Christ the grter num̃ at least wise being assembled.

2. It was argued whither o' Br. Fletcher, stood not yet a pbatationer?

& Twas resolved that 16 of 9th 60 it being vōtd that Bro. Fletcher should be continued still upō pbatation to see if he can cā off to ye vote of the Church touching 2^d. Relations, or a Tryal of mem̃s of othr Churches dismisd to vs, touching the worke of grace, before admissiō

Bro: Fletcher thrvpō declined, as he openly had Testifyd both by word & action, as sevrā did there hold forth. to continue in their imploye & thrvpō euen contrary to many entreaties & psuasions had forsaken the deacons seate. so as twas not the Church, but himself that had set himself by.

Herevpō the Brethren pceeded to nōiati by paps

& whras it was objected as. Br. Ja: pker & Bro. Nuttings voteing, bec they now upō a Remoue.

This case was also agitated & it resolved, that they being yet in full cōion with us, had by rule a right of voteing & acting with us. & ought not to be denyed it so they two also vōtd

& in the votes Bro: Hinksmā had 7. Br. Farwel 5 & Jacob pker 1. vote

Heerevpō the 2 form̃ Brethen being desird their absence awhile. The rest controvertd, argued & agitatd the matter: & in fine by an unanimous vote agreed that the sd 2 former brethren, should be taken in as pbatōnrs. & nothing apping to the contrary, that it was intended by the Church in seasō to pced with them both to ordination.

So Br. Hinksmā was to keep the box. booke, & acconts of constitutiō. Br. Kemp to pvide the bread & the wine. & Bro Farwl. to take the charge of the linen & pewter &c.

this day Br. Abr. parkr was chosen in Br. Nuttings place, to take care of the clensing the meeting house that it be kept in a desent posture & of the hower glasse, Cushion &c. For a yeere.

[In margin] He refusing attend Br. Biā was chosen & acceptd

Br. Thos Barrets case was considerd on. as standing off frō Joyning in with us in cov^t bc. of a difference (as he held forth) betweene Ja: Richardsō & himself. So twas resolvd, that he should be at p^rsnt let alone & obserue to see his way, & what he would doe, seing that neither we had reasō to urge him, nor reasō to remitt his L^{rs} of dismissiō, such as wld passe current ad populū

The Accounts being giuen in by Br. Ja: Parker of the Churchs receipts expenses &c for yeere past, so far as concerns the Lo: day contributio: whras there appd sō that had not contributd to the Church stock, or aboute what was belonging to the defreying the chrg of the elemts it being objected they shld be brought up to their duty

Twas answd 1. the Church left them to their li^bty

2 that they now exempted their hauing any hand (in the disposing of any pte of the Church stock), with the rest of the brethren.

The accounts are to be dd. in to the pastō & the othr deacons, to be Recorded by them. . . .

28 of 3 65 Jos. pkers wife & hr children dismissed to the Church at Groton

as aboute a q^r of a yeere before: the wife of Jam: parker. of Jam: Fiske. of Joⁿ Nutten likewise with their children dismissed. as before. .

2d of 8 65 This day after the Afternoone exercise the Church met at my house . . .

2 My son Moses was ppounded to the Church to joyne in full fellowship . . .

5 of 9 65 Moses fiske, after a p^rfesiō of his faith made in the publ. congregatiō respecting both the doctrine of faith: & the worke of faith upō his owne soule: & the manifestation of his appbatiō of & consent to the confessiō of this Church: was receiued into the cov^t of this Church, & so into full cōion.

This day Moses fiske exercised in publ. on the afternoone, frō Eccl. 12. 1. 12 of 9. 65 . . .

Bro: Joⁿ Wrights child baptized. Ebenezer Wright. 28 of 11. . .

11 of 12 65 Elizabeth Steuens Baptised

18 of 12 65. Lidiah Parker the daughter of Abrā pker baptisd . . .

Samuel	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Whitemore the sons of o}^r \\ \text{sister Butterfeild in ther} \end{array} \right\}$	Baptised 8 of 5. 66
Pelataiah		
Abraham		
minority		

y. 65 CHILDREN BAPTISED IN CHELMS. CHURCH

- 9 of 1 Rachel the daughter of Jac. & Sarah pker
- 15. of 11. Josiah & Benj: the sons of John & Hannah Blanchard
- 12 of 2. Mehitebel Baret the daughter of Tho: (& Francis)
- 24 of. 4. Solomō Keyes the sō of Solomō & Francis
- 15. of. 7 Samuel procter the sō of Rob. & (Sarah)
- 11 of 9 Ebenezer Wright the son of John (& Abigaile)
- 8 of 12 Eliz. Steuens the daughtē of John (& Elisabeth)
- 1. of 2^d 65 Eliz. & Mary the daughters of James & Margaret
Hildreth . . .

On this day Bridget the wife of Ja: Ritchardsō taken into full fellowship & her youngst child baptisd. [In margin] 16. of 7. 66
Bridget Ritchardsō receid Eliz. hr daughter baptisd . . .

the daughter of Sa: Fletchers Wife viz. Margeter fletcher [In margin] Hannah Fletcher Baptised

Baptised Tho: & James the sons of sister Ritchardsō the wife of Ja: Ritchardsō. [In margin] 23 of 7. 66. Tho Ja: Ritchardsō Bapt. . . .

Josua fletcher Vpon a Report touching Jos. Fl. that he had ben at Road Island among the Quakers. & of his idle expensive caroses at Grotō Concord &c The Ch. was called to consider of the matter. Br. Adams confirmd the report. saying to this effect in the Church That he was in a way to ruine himself, & to spoyle othrs, & he would be in danger to spoyle his children (for at that time one of his sons was with Jos. at Groton . gone thithr when he was frō home. & had ben thr sevrall dayes, & had bought a horse thr (but his fa: made his bargayne voyd.) in the pcesse of the discourse. Br. Adams p'ssed the Church to brake into the ground work. viz. his fathrs family, & spake much that way, laying the cause & roote of all this, upō the pñts & family. whrvpō the Church chose sevrall to be joynd with the officer to search into the matter, & to drue it as far as they could & then to bring it unto the Church. the brethren chosen were. Br. Farwel Br. Spalding Br. Adams. who declined to act in the matter bec. of relatiō to the Church chose Leift. Fostr in his roome. othrs p'sent at the p'vate agitation at my house were Br. Barge Br. Jac. pker Br. Kemp. Moses Fiske.

y. 66. on 26 of. 10. we met, & Jos. Fl. attended. sev'al things were spoke to him. but he excused & evaded all. & in reference to his leaving his fa: family & so being out of Gods way, alledged his fathrs consent.

& as to the cause there were sō that would manage that besids for more p'vat examinng of things betw his fa: & him.

y. 66. upō 1. of 11. Jos. being sent to by Br. Farwel & br. Spalding to attend on this day after the Lecture, who also had pmisd them yet attended not the brethren, who wayted for his coming till nigh sun set. & after we had information that he wd by the house in the time whilst we were together, with Mary Martin behind him.

Matters lay vpō furthr enq'ry & consideratiō vntill 3^{mo} 67. & then vpō a Sab. day after the aftrnoone exercise he had notice by J^{cn} Burge & Jac. Parker to attend the Church but he attended not.

About a 4^{night} or 3. weeks after, he was called forth in the next congregation: & chrgd with these 4 ptic.

1st his non-attendance upō the Church when req'd

2^d his non-attendance upō the officer & Br. when req'd

3. his non-attendance upō catechising neithr in publ. nor p'uate since his leaueing his fathers house.

4. his non-attendance upō his fathrs counsel & govru^t.

his Answr to the last was, that he could not justify, bt did condeme himself in pte. the other he somewhat shifted & excusd

But before his charges. he publickly ownd himself (being demandd) to be under the watch & govru^t of Christ in his Church.)

After sevral agitations in sd p'vate Church meetings aboute the matter twas voted: that he should be admonished the vote passed 23 of 4. 67

The admonitiō was giuen 30 of 4. 67. The ground was. his haueing for sō space of time acted the pte of a Child of Belial. 2 Cor. 6. 15...

18. of 12. 67 A ch. meeting upō the Deacons Accounts . . .

This day there passed these vots . . .

3 That the Deacons lay out to the value of 20 s^s for the use of S. Shiply this following yeere, to the procuring her sō wine, sugar or such other Refreshings, as she may stand in need of: & to bring it in, in the accounts. . . .

Hannah Balke recei^d into full coion this day seuennight she had this day 2 children viz Hannah & Sarah Baptisd [In margin] 23 of 3. 69 Hannah Balke . . .

This d. the sc̄rt. (Tho. Ad. & his wife absent.) phebe Ritchardsō the daughter of sister Ritchrdsō & Ja: Ritch^{ds} Baptised 10 of 2. 70 . . .

Mary Butterfeild Baptisd. the daughter of Mary Butterfeild 8 of 3. 70 Nathaniel Blogged the sō of dan Blogged baptised 15. of 3. 70 . . .

1 of 6. 70. Bro. [Henry] Farewel dyed suddenly in the morn: & was buried upō o^r Lecture day. . . .

1 of 10. 70. Bro: Butterfeilds Accounts . . .

 đđ to Sister Shiply 00 - 12 - 00

 " to Sister Shiply y. 70 00 - 10 - 00 . . .

Mary Warren the Daughter of Rich. Hildr. p'sentd hrselſe to Tryal. 18 of 2. 72 ppounded to the Church. ppounded in the publ. congregatiō 22 of 2 72 After owned hr sa: Cov^t. & hr 2 childr baptised 28. of 2. 72 . . .

30 of 1. 73 Josiah Ritchrdsō in m^o 2^d his Children Baptisd

11 of 3. 73 Priscilla Spalding This day she haueing stood ppounded a forthnight, was Admitted (Her Relation being Red) vnto full cōion. hr children Dorathy, & Deborah & Sarah. Baptised

13 of 5. 73 Lidia perhā This day hr relatiō being Red, & othr things orderly attended. She was admitted to full coion Her Children: Mary, John, Joseph, Anna Baptisd

10 of 6. 73 Hannah Spalding Received into full cōion with the Church & hr 6. Children on 24 of 6 Baptised viz. John, Edward, Samuel, Vnice, Hannah. Deborah.

24 of 6. 73 Mary Woodhead Recei^d into full cōion in this Church. & her 2 children that had ben before baptised in Concord.

17 of 8. 73 Mary Waddle She haueing ben Admitted into full fellowsh with this Church: was herself & her 3 childr Mary. Rose. & Williā. Baptised. in p'snce of the Congregatiō.

9 of 9. 73 Hannah farwel, She Admittd to o^r cov^t & Afr Hannah, Joseph, Elizabeth baptised

14 of 10 73 Joseph Spalding the son of Jn^o & Hannah Spalding Baptised.

11 of 11 73 Sam fletcher Señ hs Child baptised caled W^m fletcher

18 of 11. 73 Rich Hildreth had his dismissiō & of 3. of his Children, Joseph Percy & Isaack. gravnted him, to the Ch: at Cambridge: according to his desire. he declaring his purpose of setlem^t there & of liueing & dying there.

8 of 12 73 Jacob Warren Mary Warren These two admitted to full cōion this day in o^r church & they had 2 children Infants, wch they resigned to the watch of this church (Jacob. & Joseph.

31 of 11 74 Henry farwel. the son of Hannah farewel baptised . . .

Elizabeth woodhead, daughter of Sister Mary woodhead Baptised 28 of 12 74

Joseph barret (being taken into ful fellowship last Sabbat) was on this day baptised & his daughter Rebeca: 4 of 2. 75 . . .

Rev. James DeNormandie, D.D., presented to the Society the original commission signed by Governor Pownall, August 8, 1757, appointing Sir William Pepperrell Lieutenant-General of the militia of the Province of Massachusetts Bay.

Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis, of Cambridge, was elected a Resident Member.

A new serial of the Proceedings, comprising the record of the May and June meetings, was ready at this meeting.